

## REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicants amended claims 16-18 and 20-22 to remove the “means” language and recite that the operations are performed by a filter and neural network. These added requirements are disclosed in at least pgs. 6-8 and 13-14 of the Specification.

Applicants submit herewith a terminal disclaimer to overcome the non-statutory double patenting rejection (Office Action, pgs. 2-3) based on the parent patent to the present continuation application, U.S. Patent No. 6,633,855.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-37 as obvious (35 U.S.C. §103(a)) over Ayyadurai (U.S. Patent No. 6,718,367) in view of Russell-Falla (U.S. Patent No. 6,675,162). Applicants traverse.

Claims 1, 16, and 23 concern filtering communications received from over a network for a person-to-person communication program, and require: receiving a communication for the person-to person communication program; processing the communication to determine predefined language statements; inputting information on the determined language statements into a neural network to produce an output value; determining whether the output value indicates that the communication is unacceptable; forwarding the communication to the person-to-person communication program unchanged if the output value indicates that the communication is acceptable; and performing an action with respect to the communication upon determining that the communication is unacceptable that differs from the forwarding of the communication that occurs if the output value indicates that the communication is acceptable.

A review of the cited art reveals that the cited references alone and in combination do not teach or suggest the claim requirements that a neural network is inputted with predefined language statements from a communication to a person-to-person communication program to produce an output value used to determine whether the communication should be forwarded to the communication program.

The Examiner recognized that Ayyadurai does not teach inputting information on the determined language statements into a neural network, and cited col. 6, lines 35 to col. 7, line 24 of Russell-Falla as teaching the requirements concerning the neural network. (Office Action, pg. 5) Applicants traverse.

The cited cols. 6-7 of Russell-Falla discuss a neural network that receives terms for web pages and analyzes the content of the training pages to adjust weights assigned to terms in a weighted list. Error information accumulated by comparing a predetermined designation to the

determined weightings is used to adjust the weightings. This process is repeated to arrive at weightings that are highly predictive of the content type. The process involves creating for each training page a list of unique words and phrases and the occurrence of each expression in the training pages is statistically analyzed to identify those expressions useful for discriminating the type of content. A target attribute set of attributes indicative of a type of content are ranked in order of frequency of appearance in “good” and “bad” pages.

The final weighting values may be stored in a database and included in a software product. (Russell-Falla, col. 7, lines 33-37) The software product may then detect and act upon content of the web pages. (col. 8, lines 20-55)

Thus, the cited Russell-Falla discusses how to use a neural network with training data to generate a set of weightings for terms that can then be incorporated into a product to filter and categorize web pages. There is no teaching in the cited Russell-Falla of using a neural network to process language statements in a communication and then using the output from the neural network to determine whether to forward the communication to a person-to-person communication program. Instead, the cited Russell-Falla uses the neural network to determine the weighting list that is incorporated into the software product and used to detect and act upon content in web pages.

The cited Russell-Falla does not teach or suggest using a neural network to process communication statements to determine whether that processed communication should be forwarded to the communication program. Instead, in the cited Russell-Falla, the neural network processes training data or web pages to generate the weighting list to include in the end product, not to process statements to provide a value used to determine whether to forward a communication. For instance, the cited Russell-Falla does not teach using a neural network to process a web page to determine whether the processed web page should be sent to the browser if the neural network output value indicates an acceptable page.

The Examiner cited col. 5, line 60 to col. 7, line 32 of Ayyadurai as teaching the claim requirements of determining whether the output value indicates that the communication is unacceptable; forwarding the communication to the person-to-person communication program unchanged if the output value indicates that the communication is acceptable. (Office Action, pg. 4) Applicants traverse.

The cited cols. 5-7 discuss how a clustering process including algorithms that looks at the words and frequency of words in a message to determine different properties of the message, such as attitude, customer type, author's education level, that are sent to a learning process to improve the classification and assignment properties. The output properties of the messages can be used with other determined message factors, to enable auto-responses, one-to-many routing.

The cited cols. 5-7 discuss how to train the clustering process to properly assign and classify messages. There is no teaching or mention in the cited cols. 5-7 of determining whether an output value indicates that a communication is unacceptable, such that the communication is forwarded if the communication is acceptable.

Accordingly, claims 1, 6, and 23 are patentable over the cited art because the Ayyadurai and Russell-Falla do not teach or suggest all the claim requirements alone or in combination.

Claims 2-5, 7-22, and 24-37 are patentable over the cited art because they depend from one of claims 1, 6, and 23, which are patentable over the cited art for the reasons discussed above.

With respect to the dependent claims, the Examiner cited col. 6, line 35 to col. 7, line 24 Russell-Falla as teaching all the requirements of the dependent claims. However, the Examiner just generally stated that the cited Russell-Falla teaches the additional requirements of the dependent claims without specific explanation of how the cited Russell-Falla corresponds to the claim requirements. Applicants submit that the Examiner's claim rejections of the dependent claims does not comply with the requirements for claim rejections specified in the Code of Federal Regulations, which requires that:

When a reference is complex or shows or describes inventions other than that claimed by the applicant, the particular part relied on must be designated as nearly as practicable. The pertinence of each reference, if not apparent, must be clearly explained and each rejected claim specified.

37 CFR §1.104(c)(2); MPEP Sec. 707.

Here, the Examiner did not designate to any degree the "particular part relied on" of these references for the specific requirements of the dependent claims. For instance, the Examiner did not show how specific sections, such as lines, columns, paragraphs, figures, etc. of the references teach or suggest specific claim requirements. Thus, Applicants submit that the Examiner's rejection is improper for not showing the specific sections of the references that disclose the

particular claim requirements. Applicants request that the Examiner show how specific sections of the cited references disclose specific requirements of all the claims if the rejections are maintained in order to provide applicants an opportunity to concisely respond.

Below, Applicants explain why the cited cols. 6-7 of Russell-Falla do not teach or suggest the requirements of dependent claims.

Claims 2, 17, and 24 depend from claims 1, 16, and 23, respectively, and require that the person-to-person communication program is intended for use in a work environment, and wherein determining predefined language statements comprises determining non-work related terms that are often searched for by employees.

The cited cols. 6-7 of Russell-Falla discuss a neural network that receives terms for web pages and analyzes the content and adjusts the weightings for terms extracted from the web pages used as training data. This process is repeated to formulate weighted values for terms using the training pages. The adjusted weighting values may then be provided to a software product. A target attribute set of attributes indicative of a type of content are ranked in order of frequency of appearance in “good” and “bad” pages.

Nowhere do the cited cols. 6-7 anywhere teach or suggest that the predefined language statements inputted to the neural network to determine whether the communication should be forwarded comprise non-work related terms as claimed. Instead, the cited Russell-Falla discusses the use of a neural network to generate weightings for expressions for use by a software product to categorize a web page.

Accordingly, claims 2, 17, and 24 provide additional grounds of patentability over the cited art because the additional requirements of these claims are not taught or suggested in the cited art.

Claim 3 was amended to depend from claim 2.

Amended claims 3 and 25 depend from claims 2 and 24, respectively, and further require that the neural network includes an input node for each predefined language statement and wherein inputting the information on the determined non-work related statements comprises inputting a value related to number of occurrences of each non-work related statement on the input node corresponding to the non-work related statement.

The cited cols. 6-7 of Russell-Falla discuss a neural network that receives terms for web pages and analyzes the content and adjusts the weightings for terms extracted from the web

pages used as training data. This process is repeated to formulate weighted values for terms using the training pages. The adjusted weighting values may then be provided to a software product. A target attribute set of attributes indicative of a type of content are ranked in order of frequency of appearance in “good” and “bad” pages.

Although the cited cols. 6-7 mention a neural network to generate weightings for terms, nowhere do the cited cols. 6-7 anywhere teach or suggest that the neural network includes an input node for each predefined language statement and that a number of the occurrences of the predefined statement are inputted on the input node corresponding to the non-work related statement. There is no teaching or mention of inputting the number of occurrences of non-work related terms at input nodes of the neural network corresponding to those non-work related items. Instead, the cited neural network analyzes training pages to adjust weightings for terms that are initially set to random values. (Russell-Falla, col. 7, lines 58-65).

Accordingly, claims 3 and 25 provide additional grounds of patentability over the cited art because the additional requirements of these claims are not taught or suggested in the cited art.

Amended claims 6 and 28 depend from claims 5 and 27, respectively, and further require that the neural network includes an input node for each inappropriate term for the predetermined age level and wherein inputting the information on the determined inappropriate terms for the predetermined age level comprises inputting a value related to a number of occurrences of each inappropriate term for the predetermined age level on the input node corresponding to the inappropriate term for the predetermined age level.

Applicants amended these claims to clarify that the number of occurrences of the inappropriate term for the predetermined age level are inputted to the input node corresponding to that inappropriate term.

The cited cols. 6-7 of Russell-Falla discuss a neural network that receives terms for web pages and analyzes the content and adjusts the weightings for terms extracted from the web pages used as training data. This process is repeated to formulate weighted values for terms using the training pages. The adjusted weighting values may then be provided to a software product. A target attribute set of attributes indicative of a type of content are ranked in order of frequency of appearance in “good” and “bad” pages.

Although the cited cols. 6-7 mention a neural network to generate weightings for terms, nowhere do the cited cols. 6-7 anywhere teach or suggest that the neural network includes an input node for each inappropriate term for a predetermined age level and that a number of the occurrences of each inappropriate term in the document are inputted to the input nodes corresponding to the predetermined term. There is no teaching or mention of inputting the number of occurrences of inappropriate terms for an age level in a communication on input nodes of the neural network corresponding to those inappropriate terms. Instead, the cited neural network analyzes training pages to adjust weightings for terms that are initially set to random values. (Russell-Falla, col. 7, lines 58-65).

Accordingly, claims 6 and 28 provide additional grounds of patentability over the cited art because the additional requirements of these claims are not taught or suggested in the cited art.

Claims 10, 20, and 32 depend from claims 1, 16, and 23, respectively, and further require that processing the communication comprises determining a weighted number of occurrences of predefined language statements, wherein the neural network includes an input node for each predefined language statement and wherein inputting the information on the determined language statements comprises inputting the weighted number of occurrences of each predefined language statement on the input node corresponding to the predefined language statement.

The cited cols. 6-7 of Russell-Falla discuss a neural network that receives terms for web pages and analyzes the content and adjusts the weightings for terms extracted from the web pages used as training data. This process is repeated to formulate weighted values for terms using the training pages. The adjusted weighting values may then be provided to a software product. A target attribute set of attributes indicative of a type of content are ranked in order of frequency of appearance in “good” and “bad” pages.

Although the cited cols. 6-7 mention a neural network to generate weightings for terms, nowhere do the cited cols. 6-7 anywhere teach or suggest that the neural network includes an input node for each predefined language statement and that a weighted number of occurrences of each predefined language statement are inputted on the input nodes corresponding to the predefined language statements. There is no teaching or mention of inputting the weighted number of occurrences of predefined language statements in a communication on input nodes of the neural network corresponding to those predefined language statements. Instead, the cited

neural network analyzes training pages to adjust weightings for terms that are initially set to random values. (Russell-Falla, col. 7, lines 58-65).

Accordingly, claims 10, 20, and 32 provide additional grounds of patentability over the cited art because the additional requirements of these claims are not taught or suggested in the cited art.

Claims 11, 21, and 33 depend from claims 10, 20, and 32, respectively, and additionally require that the predefined language statements include unacceptable language statements and content language statements, and determining proximity of predefined content and unacceptable language statements and inputting information on the proximity of the predefined language statements at input nodes, wherein the output value is based on the number of occurrences of unacceptable and content language statements and the proximity of content and unacceptable language statements.

The cited cols. 6-7 of Russell-Falla discuss a neural network that receives terms for web pages and analyzes the content and adjusts the weightings for terms extracted from the web pages used as training data. This process is repeated to formulate weighted values for terms using the training pages. The adjusted weighting values may then be provided to a software product. A target attribute set of attributes indicative of a type of content are ranked in order of frequency of appearance in “good” and “bad” pages.

Although the cited cols. 6-7 mention a neural network to generate weightings for terms, nowhere do the cited cols. 6-7 anywhere teach or suggest determining a proximity of predefined content and unacceptable language statement to input at input nodes of the neural network. The Examiner has not cited any part of Russell-Falla that teaches or mentions considering both the number of occurrences and proximity of unacceptable and content language statements.

Accordingly, claims 11, 21, and 33 provide additional grounds of patentability over the cited art because the additional requirements of these claims are not taught or suggested in the cited art.

### Conclusion

For all the above reasons, Applicant submits that the pending claims 1-37 are patentable. Should any additional fees be required beyond those paid, please charge Deposit Account No. 09-0449.

The attorney of record invites the Examiner to contact him at (310) 553-7977 if the Examiner believes such contact would advance the prosecution of the case.

Dated: January 7, 2008

By: /David Victor/

David W. Victor  
Registration No. 39,867

Please direct all correspondences to:

David W. Victor  
Konrad Raynes & Victor, LLP  
315 South Beverly Drive, Ste. 210  
Beverly Hills, CA 90212  
Tel: (310) 553-7977  
Fax: 310-556-7984